



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,679	10/17/2005	Peter Tass	23384	1840
535 7590 04/29/2009				
K.F. ROSS P.C. 5683 RIVERDALE AVENUE SUITE 203 BOX 900 BRONX, NY 10471-0900				
EXAMINER				
EVANSKO, GEORGE ROBERT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3762				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/29/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/553,679

Applicant(s)

TASS, PETER

Examiner

George R. Evanisko

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 78-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 78-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/29/09
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/29/09 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claim 88 is objected to because of the following informalities: There are two claims 88. The examiner has interpreted the second claim as 89 and the claim should be amended accordingly. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 78-81 and 84-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fischell et al (6459936). Fischell applies offset stimulation signals to neuron populations and subpopulations to stop/prevent/reset/reverse/desynchronize the populations as an epilepsy

treatment therapy (e.g. see col. 15, col. 22-24, etc) using stimulation that can be from 0.1 Hz to 1000 Hz for 1 millisecond to 30 minutes.

Claims 78-81 and 84-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pless (7174213). Pless applies offset stimulation signals to neuron populations and subpopulations to stop/prevent/reset/reverse/desynchronize the populations as an epilepsy treatment therapy (e.g. see col. 18, using different electrodes to deliver different pulse to pulse timing, figures 3, 4, 21, 22, etc) using stimulation that can be from around 0.5 Hz to 500 Hz for 0.05 to 60 minutes and shows in figure 3 a set of 4 pulses in a burst being delivered. NOTE, different pulse to pulse timings (i.e. different frequencies) will necessarily result in pulses being offset from one another. For example, electrodes firing at 3, 5, and 7 Hz will provide different offsets.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 81-83 and 87-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischell or Pless.

Fischell or Pless discloses the claimed invention and setting different offset parameters for particular patient based on the patient's neural disease (e.g. epileptic focus) during testing of the patient (e.g. col. 24 in Fischell, col. 10, 11, in Pless) except for the exact pulse parameters of all having the same time duration, being identical, or the offsets being identical. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the stimulation systems and methods as taught by Fischell or Pless with the exact pulse parameters of all having the same time duration, being identical, or the offsets being identical, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art [*In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233] and since it has been held that a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ (Please see MPEP 2144.05). In addition, since Fischell or Pless both disclose trying different electrical stimulation parameters to determine the appropriate stimulation for a particular patient, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to try different stimulation parameters, such as the exact pulse parameters of all having the same time duration, being identical, or the offsets being identical, to provide the predictable results of an effective stimulation pattern and therapy to suit a particular patient's needs and disease.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment. The argument that Fischell discloses that it "may be" desirable that the delays be adjusted so that the pulses may reach the event focus at the same time and in phase is not persuasive since "may be" is an alternative embodiment and does NOT require Fischell's system/method to perform that function. In addition, it is unclear why the applicant has chosen to ignore the very next sentence in Fischell of "alternatively, experience may indicate that certain signals being out of phase when they arrive at

the neurological event focus may be particularly efficacious in aborting a neurological event. In regards to Pless, the different electrodes of Pless are at different locations (since they all cant be in the same location) and since Pless states they are at different locations (e.g. col. 18) and therefore will stimulate different subpopulations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R. Evanisko whose telephone number is 571 272 4945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571 272 4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George R Evanisko/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3762

Application/Control Number: 10/553,679
Art Unit: 3762

Page 6